Smith's Report

Number 27 OCTOBER 1995

Bradley R. Smith
P.O. Box 3267
Visalia CA 93278

T: 209.627.8757
F: 209.733.2653
E-mail: brsmith@valleynet.com

Friend:

REVISIONIST VIDEOTAPE ON AUSCHWITZ IN HANDS OF NEARLY ALL FOREIGN LEADERS. With the help of an Oregon supporter I mailed a copy of the Auschwitz video, "David Cole Interviews Dr. Franciszek Piper," to the presidents, prime ministers and sundry tyrants who rule the governments in Eastern Europe and the old Soviet Empire, the Moslem countries in the Mid-East, Africa and Asia, as well as government leaders in the Far East, Latin America and Africa.

Ph Dr. Jan Strasky, the *Ministr Depravy of the Ceske republiky,* has sent me a thank-you note for the video from Prague.

The postal services, if that is the right word for them, of Afghanistan and Liberia have returned the video with a sticker saying that the postal service is temporarily closed down.

In a (somewhat) related vein, the *Yale Daily News* has returned my last opinion piece to its editor marked "Refused. Return to sender."

SMITH'S REMARKABLE SPEED *The Holocaust Center Newsletter*, sponsored by the United Jewish Federation of Pittsburgh PA, reports that Slippery Rock University held a week long Holocaust Remembrance in April.

"Interesting to note was the speed at which Holocaust revisionist Bradley Smith was able to find out about this school's plans and submit his infamous college newspaper Ad calling for a questioning of the Holocaust. As it is the schools policy to publish all Ads, they did so, however the student response in regards to this Ad were admirably intelligent and showed complete disagreement with his position."

The ad the article refers to is "A Revisionist Challenge to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum".

NOTE: MY NEW E-MAIL NUMBER IS:
brsmith@valleynet.com

CODOH'S MUSEUM AD RUNS IN UNIQUE VIRGINIA NEWSPAPER. *The Eccentric Monthly* is a privately held tabloid published for an audience of 110,000 students, faculty and staff at five colleges in Western Virginia. The *Eccentric* is distributed free at Radford University (where there was a little turmoil when our ad ran there in April), Virginia Tech, Hollins College, Roanoke College, New River Community College and the surrounding community, all of which have now had the opportunity to read "A Revisionist Challenge to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum."

WE'VE DONE IT! WE HAVE A SITE ON THE WORLD WIDE WEB ON THE INTENET

Hallelujah! The bloody thing is up there. It's like a space station somewhere out in the cosmos. It has very little content, it's commander has only a skeleton crew, and the station's contact with earth is tenuous. This will begin to change over the next 30 days.

I thought about this Website for a year, read the relevant literature for six months, announced publicly I was going to get it up there, then I procrastinated, worried about all the technology that lies behind it until the time came when I had to just do it, like the advertisements for running shoes say, so I did it.

On top of that I've got the new Windows95 operating system, Eudora (e-mail system) and Netscape (the primary Internet research tool). That's the basic technology. I don't need any more. All it took to put it together was a consultant, several hundred dollars which was marked to go to creditors who will now have to wait for payment another month or longer, and the help of a couple computer-savvy friends.

The site is devided into four broad categories of interest, while each category is devided into specific articles or groups of articles: **Committe for Open Debate on the Holocaust, The Campus Project, Videos, Audios and Books For Sale, etc.**, and **Smith vs. Real Life: the Personal Side**. Those topics

underlined (on the Web, rather than being underlined, they are a different color) have a little content which the viewer can call up now and read. The others are empty, waiting for their creator to breathe life into them.

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust.

Statement of Purpose, Director's Page, ThoughtCrimes Archive, The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, The Nuremberg Trials, Zyklon B and Diesel Exhaust, Crimes Against Humanity, Book Reviews

The Campus Project.

Campus Update, The Press Responds, Zionism for Students, The Talmud for Students, "The Case for Open Debate on the Holocaust," The "Human Soap Holocaust Myth," "A Revisionist Challenge to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum."

Videos, Audios and Books for sale, etc.

On Auschwitz: "David Cole Interviews Dr. Fransciszek Piper." (I'll do the ad for the Cole video first, then I'll post the others.)

Smith vs. Real Life: The Personal Side

What Smith is Doing and Why, Smith's Internet Journal, *Break His Bones* (excerpts), *Smith's Report (excerpts),* Other writings

OUR ADDRESS ON THE WORLD WIDE WEB IS:
http://www.valleynet.com/~brsmith

THE NIZKOR PROJECT This is the sort of thing we're up against and one reason why it is so important for us to be on the Internet. The Nizkor Project (in Hebrew -- "we will remember") is only one of many sites on the World Wide Web that is posting massive amounts of holocaust-related materials -- all of it reinforcing the orthodox viewpoint.

Most of the computer literate population of North America, Europe and the rest of the world, which includes nearly all media, whether electronic or print, all college campuses and most of the student press, are "wired" to the Internet.

Historically media, with the backing of the universities, has transmitted the orthodox holocaust story line to the public, but during the first half of the 1990s we demonstrated with the Campus Project that with a little imagination, traditional media can also be used successfully to forward *revisionsm* to the media and campus.

The Internet and the World Wide Web are part of a new electronic resource at the cutting edge of (primarily) American technology. The Internet is especially attractive to the largest part of our brightest young people, and it's particularly attractive to students and student journalists. That's the population the Campus/Internet Project will continue to address. It's unthinkable that I should not use the Internet as one tool to reach out to that and other populations.

The Nizkor Project was established with the precise purpose of discrediting revisionist theory and revisionists as individuals. It was founded and is directed by Ken McVay, an American now living in Vancouver, Canada. Following are two paragraphs from his own Internet "Homepage," written by himself I suppose.

"Today, utilizing a new computer and direct intenet link, he is building on of the most extensive and thorough information bases about the Holocaust and the activities of racists and white supremacists [sic] in the world. McVay and his team of nearly *100 volunteers* (my emphasis) devote countless hours to the maintenance and improvement of this massive collection -- hours which represent *over one-and-a-half million dollars of donated effort* (my emphasis).

"At the moment, McVay is directing a massive effort to construct what will arguably become the world's largest Holocaust-resource Web site, one which will offer over a gigabyte -- if I have this right, one gigabite is a thousand "megabites." A megabite is a million "bites." A bite is one "character," that is, one letter or one number -- of material within the next few years, including the entire transcript of the Nuremberg Trials. His Web site has already proven itself to be an invaluable tool for Holocaust researchers, the media, students, and those concerned with the alarming rise of neo-Nazi [sic] activity on the Internet."

And I'm sure it has become a tool of real significance. It would be absolutely pointless, as well as unprofessional, to allow all this information to be accessed by university students and others without attempting to make an effective response. That's the role of the Campus / Internet Project.

Following is a reproduction of McVay's Homepage, the first thing you see when you punch up his numbers on your keyboard.

The Nizkor Project

Dedicated to the nearly twelve million souls
ruthlessly destroyed by Adolf Hitler and his Nazi regime

...truth is far more fragile than fiction
...reason alone cannot protect it.

Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*

[**Home** | FTP Archives | HWEB | FAQs | RUE | Other Sites | Objectives & Funding]

Nizkor is not a single collection of Web pages. It is a collage of different projects. Its existence is the result of the efforts of many people.

Those projects are:

`The Shofar FTP Archive.`
These are over 3,000 files, collected over the past four years. Until April, 1995, these files were only available via an email. Now, they are accessible via ftp, making browsing much easier.

`The HWEB Project.`
Not satisfied with mere "plaintext," a small army of volunteers has organized to put the entire FTP archive onto the World-Wide Web. This project is still in progress. When complete, it will offer the largest on-line collection of information on the Holocaust and Holocaust-denial, extensively cross-linked, and easily searchable. Its benefit to amateur researchers will be difficult to overstate.

`The FAQs.`
Providing background information for the Usenet newsgroup alt.revisionism, these four large files have served as "a layman's guide" to issues surrounding Holocaust-denial since 1993.

`The RUE Project.`
The Revisionist Usenet Experience: an effort to document the refutation of Holocaust-deniers on alt.revisionism. Its goal is to demonstrate, through reference to discussion archives, the credibility gaps surrounding individual deniers. Begun in late 1994 as a personal project separate from Nizkor, it has recently moved to this site.

Please note that this site is still in the early stages of construction. Many links are not complete yet. Eventually, all four FAQs will be on the Web, and the RUE project should be more-complete soon. By early September, the HWEB project will be underway, and HWEB pages will begin appearing as volunteers complete them. An automated "What's New?" page will be added to track progress. For now, little information is available except The Auschwitz FAQ and the FTP Archive.

If you would like to comment on this Web site in general, or on any technical issues, please contact its webmaster at webmaster@nizkor.almanac.bc.ca or the director of the Nizkor Project, Ken McVay, at kmcvay@nizkor.almanac.bc.ca.

"Nizkor" is a Hebrew word meaning "we will remember."

[**Home** | FTP Archives | HWEB | FAQs | RUE | Other Sites | Objectives & Funding]

The Nizkor Project
webmaster@nizkor.almanac.bc.ca
Director: Ken McVay OBC

August 24, 1995

BREAK HIS BONES In August I mailed queries to 20 important periodicals around the country offering the right to excerpt a section of the manuscript. Last week I received a letter from an editor at one of the really top magazines in the country saying yes, she wants to see it. She knows who I am, what I do and what I've done. She's not taking a run in the dark. This sort of thing has always fallen through in the past, but that was the past. We'll have to wait and see. But if this particular magazine does print something from *Bones*, it will cause a sensation.

A LEGAL INQUIRY CONTINUES. Following Hans Schmidt's arrest in Germany for having committed a thought crime, Andrew Allen is pressing the German consulate for a position statement regarding which revisionist materials Americans can carry to Germany without the threat of being arrested. The consulate is referring us to Bonn. See the letter of Herr Harmel below.

Once the German government has taken a stand on whether the submitted materials are illegal, we can review the legal grounds to pursue this matter either in United States courts pursuant to German-American treaty obligations or in the World court. The materials included *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* by Butz, *Did Six Million Really Die* by Harwood (et.al.), *The Amazing Rapidly Shrinking Holocaust* by McCalden, and *Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist* by Smith. Allen's latest letter follows:

"*August 30, 1995*
Generalkonsulat der Bundesrepublic Deutschland
Att: Mr. Paul Harmel
1960 Jackson Street
San Francisco, California 94109
Telecopier number (415) 775-0187
Re: Regulations on speech and importation of printed materials of which American visitors should be aware.

"Dear Mr. Harmel:

"I would like to thank you for your help and advice concerning the above topic. However, the information which you gave me raises certain questions which would be helpful to resolve. I have included with this letter various newspaper articles showing that this issue is of great current importance to American visitors.

"For example, my notes show that you informed me that the maximum sentence for violation of StGB Section 131 was two years in prison. Please note that Mr. Althans was sentenced to three 1/2 years. This leads me to believe that there are other laws on this matter which we are unaware of.

"I recognize that researching German law may be an arduous task but I hope that it will allow us to avoid the expense and negative publicity which could arise if my client inadvertently violates German law.

"I suggest that I send you a copy of the literature which my client proposes to import to the Bundesrepublk Deutschland *and that your office give me an opinion if this would cause any problems.*

Please let me know if your office can assist. Again, thank you for the help already provided.

Sincerely yours,
Andrew Allen"

WILLIS CARTO VS. THE HINDENBERG? I have received an 8-page pamphlet from The Foundation to Defend the First Amendment (FDFA), a Liberty Lobby/Willis Carto entity. Titled: "A Report on the ADL, Mossad and CIA Links to the MARCH 22, 1995 Swat Team Raid On Liberty Lobby," one of its major thrusts is to demonstrate that Andrew Allen is a Mossad operative.

Meanwhile, FDFA, using a team of professional researchers, and with the help of "Former Mossad officer Victor Ostrovsky," has discovered that both Janet Reno and President Clinton were involved in the March 22, 1995 "multi-jurisdictional SWAT team" raid on the "West Coast Office" of Liberty Lobby. This is Willis' home where he most likely has a desk and telephone. When such high mugawumps as Clinton and Reno are after you, you know how very, very important you are.

One important discovery FDFA has made is that Andrew Allen is a long-time covert operative with service in the Middle East (Afghanistan, only a small stretch, I suppose) and at least tactical deployment in the Far East (Burma). FDFA was able to ferret out this deep background because it has men like Mr. Ostrovsky to advise it.

I had to find these things out for myself. Five years ago when I was in the Bay Area I visited with Allen and he pulled out his travel photos and showed me snapshots of him in Afghanistan wearing Afgan clothes. He was there on a post-college adventure informed by liberal sensibilities that adventurous young men like to have and we had a few laughs over some of his mishaps.

With regard to Allen's covert operations in the far East, FDFA dug up information that Allen is "not only a member, but also the founder and secretary of the Burma Foundation's board of directors." Who knows how many

investigators FDFA had working on this one? They got this information by discovering "documents filed by Allen himself with the Internal Revenue Service"!

About three years ago I asked Allen to act as a regional director for Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH). He said sure, and he gave me a little background on himself. Graduate of UC Berkeley in history, attorney, a member of the board of directors of the Burma Foundation. I put it all on the CODOH background sheet and distributed it to the press.

FDFA has yet another piece of strong evidence that Andrew Allen is a deep-cover agent working with and maybe even for the Mossad, the fact that "*he does not look like a Mossad agent* [my emphasis]."According FDFA's colleague, former Mossad officer Victor Ostrovsky, a general rule of thumb is, "'If someone looks like he's Mossad -- he isn't.' Andrew Allen most definitely does *not* look like he's Mossad."

Reading this Report from FDFA the feeling began to grow on me that I have rather a talent for undercover investigation, but now I'm not so sure. Looking around, I see people *everywhere* who do not look like Mossad! Maybe some of them aren't. On the other hand, most of them may be. I've occasionally suspected my wife of being undercover for the Mexican *rurales,* but recently I've been hearing rumors that in her village in *Nayarit* the Mossad has infiltrated the *tortilleria*, so who knows what she's really up to?

If you are not on Liberty Lobby's mailing list, send me a S.A.S.E. and I'll send you the 8-page FDFA pamphlet. On the one hand it's a typical conspiracy / smear job, on the other it's one of the most professionally worked-out conspiracy / smear jobs that Willis has produced. Read it closely. At first it looks like something might be there. The more closely you read it, the less there is. In the end, there's no there there at all. Nothing you can use.

As I read this Liberty Lobby screed, I wonder how it comes about that a man would choose to use his capacity for thought the way Willis has chosen to use his. He's like a child playing games he invents himself, but using real money and real people. Some of his games aren't very nice. It reminds me of the wise crack that's going 'round.

"How do you tell the difference between Willis Carto and the Hindenberg?"

"One of them is a nazi gas-bag."

I'd put the emphasis on gas bag.

A CARELESS EDITORIAL DECISION BY SMITH COMPROMISES BOTH FAURISSON AND COLE. Issue 26 of *Smith's Report* ran a letter by Robert Faurisson in which he wrote: "About David Cole's text on the 'highly likely' allegation that Jews were gassed at Struthof [see *SR*25]: Cole did not give us one word on Professor Rene Fabre's testimony! Not one word on Pressac's allusions to it in his *Struthof Album*!"

Cole replied with a 700-word letter of disbelief. "Faurisson says I did not give 'one word' on Professor Fabre's testimony. Agreed; I did not write 'one word.' I wrote two hundred ninety one (291) words! That's right; 291 words, nearly one and a half columns, dealing *only* with Professor Fabre's testimony. I mean, it's right there, in black and white, in my Struthof essay."

Well, as a matter of fact, it is right there. I know why I published Cole's original article, but why did I publish Faurisson's demonstrably inaccurate comment on it? For that matter, why did Faurisson write it?

I suppose I know why I published it. I was too careless and allowed myself to be too distracted by other matters to go back to re-read Cole's article to make sure Faurisson was right. I recall at the time thinking I should, that I half recalled that Cole *did* mention Fabre in his article. In the event, I printed an observation about Cole's work that was not only wrong, but one he feels is damaging to him.

At the same time, I compromised Faurisson as well. His assertion about Cole not mentioning Fabre is too inattentive to the facts to have been done consciously, in my view. Everyone makes a careless oversight like this one sometime in his life and afterwards you wish you had taken an extra moment to reflect on what you were writing or saying.

I'm not going to print the full text of Cole's letter. It contains charges with implications so broad that the furor they would cause could not possibly be handled in this newsletter. That doesn't mean I believe they should not be aired. I'll talk to Cole about airing them, and I'll try to talk to Faurisson about it. I don't like what's coming down the pike, but it's coming.

If I can not publish Cole in full in SR, I have to do it someplace else. That's what it means to have an open debate. I'll post Cole's most recent letter, as well as some other stuff, in response to Faurisson on the CODOH Website. When it gets up there anyone will be able to download it and print it out, including myself.

LETTERS

Charles Provan ***More on Pfannenstiel and Robert Faurisson. It isn't exterminationists alone who have their reasons for wanting to control who is allowed to view and who is prohibited from viewing historical documents relating to holocaust studies.***

At the time I read Dr. Faurisson's short 1986 analysis of the Pfannenstiel testimony in the *Journal for Historical Review*, I did not know all of what I have written in rebuttal above (see SR26]). But I was quite curious about how Professor Faurisson could have reached the exact opposite conclusion from Rassineir about Pfannenstiel's testimony, while examining the very same material I had.

Upon obtaining Faurisson's fax number, I wrote a courteous letter to him inquiring whether I could examine copies of the correspondence mentioned in his brief discussion of Phfnnenstiel. (I also asked him if he could tell me how to contact the excellent historical researcher, Dr. Henri Roques, the author of *The Confessions of Kurt Gerstein.*) I was sure that Professor Faurisson would let me see copies of the documents concerned, since:

1) Professor Faurisson was a champion of free access to historical data. He had criticized the Exterminationists for their refusal to grant access to historical documents. In particular, he had commented negatively on the International Red Cross records center at Arolsen, since they refuse access to revisionists who wish to conduct research at the archives there. Further, Dr. Faurisson had attacked the Auschwitz State Museum for not allowing him into the Archives because he was a Revisionist.

2. I had always supported Dr. Faurisson in my articles in the *Christian News,* both before and after I became convinced that the National Socialist government of Germany had gassed Jews during WWII. To my knowledge, my writings were the only Exterminationist call to protest the beating of Faurisson, and the worldwide harassment of Revisionists.

Hence, I was greatly surprised and puzzled when I received Professor Faurisson's reply: He informed me that no discussion could take place between he and I, until I supplied him "with a photo or a drawing of a German execution gas chamber."

I at first thought that perhaps the Professor had not understood my simple queries. I wrote a further courteous letter telling him that I had no photos, but that I could describe to him what the gas chambers were like, based upon the testimony of people who worked at the various Operation Reinhard camps. I also reaffirmed my willingness to compensate him for the copies and postage.

To my further surprise, I received another letter from Professor Faurisson, again insisting that I send him a drawing of the gas chambers before he would answer any of my questions. At this point, I sent to Dr. Faurisson a third letter, in which I wrote the following:

"February 20, 1992

Dear Professor Faurisson; Perhaps there has been some misunderstanding; I do not accept your precondition to discussing the Holocaust with you. I regard your precondition as unreasonable, since the camps under discussion (Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka) were destroyed long ago. Why do I have to come up with a blueprint of the gas chambers there, in order to obtain the address of Dr. Roques, and the correspondence between the eminent Rassinier and Dr. Pfannenstiel? I do not see the connection you have made. And why must this prevent discussion of other items, important also?

I realize that you are very busy, but you have taken the time to reply to me twice. Would it take any more time to fax me the address of Dr. Roques, or to tell me how I might obtain the correspondence between Rassinier and Pfannenstiel? This correspondence is very important, since you regard it as evidence that Pfannenstiel is an unreliable witness, which is at variance with the father of Revisionism, Paul Rassinier. You cite it as such in your article in the JHR, which I quoted.

Again, I am quite willing to pay for the copies and the postage. Can you help me, please? I ask because I respect your work."

To this third letter, Dr. Faurisson never replied. However, I must tell those reading this article that I was able some time afterward to obtain the valuable Rassinier/Pfannenstiel correspondence due to the help of two sincere and very able Revisionists, to whom I owe a debt. So I was able to examine the documents, which in my opinion prove Rassinier correct and Faurisson wrong.

When the exterminationists have documents Faurisson wishes to see, and they won't let him see them until he affirms the Holocaust gas chambers, the exterminationists are bad. But when Dr. Faurisson contradicts Rassinier, and someone asks to see what proof Dr. Faurisson cites, he won't reveal the proof until the curious one "shows or draws him a gas chamber".

This "no response" response fits in well with Professor Faurisson's newly announced position on answering his exterminationist opponents. As he stated at the most recent IHR Convention while discussing the recently published *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp:*

"I think that we are going to have many, many books of this type, and I think it would be a mistake to try to answer those books. . . . we should not waste our time . . any more, I think, with the problem of the gas chamber because there is no more problem in fact."

Dr. Faurisson has in the past justly criticized many exponents of the exterminationist side, in particular the ridiculous manifesto by a group of French historians which declared that it is not necessary to prove anything about the gas chambers, since the beginning point in all investigations had to be that they existed. He has on several occasions asserted that the exterminationist viewpoint has become a religion, with Believers and with Heretics. Yet, is this not what he expects from revisionists? Belief in his assertions, with no proof necessary?"

Lou Rollins ***Charles Provan goes too far when he suggests Pfannenstiel convinced Rassinier that there were gas chambers at Belzec. And how can we believe Pfannenstiel when Kurt Gerstein and Jan Karski both give contradictory "eyewitness" evidence about the Belzec gas chambers?***

Provan's lengthy piece in SR #26 is interesting, but I'm unclear as to Provan's point. He seems to be defending the credibility of Wilhelm Pfannenstiel's postwar claims to have witnessed a gassing of Jews at Belzec. But is he?

A couple of years ago Provan was defending the credibility of Kurt Gerstien as a self-proclaimed witness to a gassing of Jews at Belzec. But as Provan is clearly aware, there are some serious discrepancies between the testimony of Gerstein and that of Pfannenstiel.

So which of these two different accounts of a gassing at Belzec does Provan now believe? Some of Gerstein's and some of Pfannenstiel's? All of Pfannenstiel's and none of Gerstein's, or vice versa?

I think Provan is misrepresenting Paul Rassinier's position vis a vis the Belzec "gas chambers" Rassinier found Pfannenstiel's private testimony sufficiently credible that he told Pfannenstiel that he would never categorically assert "There were no gas chambers in Nazi camps."

Contrary to what Provan appears to think, that does not necessarily mean that Pfannenstiel's testimony definitely convinced Rassinier, or that Rassinier positively believed in the existence of gas chambers at Belzec. Rassinier did *not* say, "There were gas chambers at Belzec -- no doubt about it." He did *not* say, "I believe there were gas chambers at Belzec. No question about it."

Indeed, one point that Provan has omitted to mention is that Rassinier, despite his being impressed with Pfannenstiel's sincerity, definitely did not believe one detail of Pfannenstiel's "eyewitness description" of a gassing at Belzec, the detail concerning the time required for the said gassing.

So Provan has, in a sense, exaggerated Rassinier's favorable attitude towards Pfannenstiel's testimony.

While it's true that respected revisionist researcher L.A. Rollins (heh, heh) *did* write, "Thus, Pfannenstiel pretty much agreed with the revisionists about the Gerstein statement, but, nevertheless, claimed to have witnessed a gassing of Jews at Belzec. Thus far, revisionists have been content to attack the extremely dubious Gerstein statement, and have not seen fit to even mention the Pfannenstiel deposition which appears to be somewhat more credible."

However, I wrote that 12 years ago or more. I would not write it today, because it's no longer true. Since I made that statement, Faurisson initiated some discussion of Pfannenstiel in at least of one his published pieces. And Alan Critchley had something in Michael Hoffman's newsletter in which Pfannenstiel was cited, (possibly as a *reliable witness)* regarding gassings.

Orest Slepokura Got your newsletter today inside its distinctive pink envelope (are you making a political or fashion statement?). When your CODOH Website goes Online, I bet it'll go off like a bomb, a revisionist bomb, to be sure! Your newsletter had a lot of good stuff, as usual. One point I want to make. It's this: the whole revisionist argument has to encompass more than just the ongoing, never-ending debate regarding the few primary Holocaust stories.

It's got to also include stuff like the Castlemont High School kids cheering the slaughter of the Jews at an afternoon showing of Schindler's List during an educational field trip designed to "sensitize" them to the fate of European Jews during WWII.

It's got to include the socio-cultural landscape, too, with its fetish for politically correct victimology and so on. And a score of other sub-themes as well. For example, even your money troubles and family worries should be part of the story. Gorbachev gave us communism with a human face. Smith gives us revisionism with a human face. I like that.

$2,000 MATCHING FUNDS OFFER

Last month a generous, practical and imaginative Indiana man offered to "match" contributions of $250 or more up to a total of $2,000, with the stipulation that his contribution go specifically toward retiring my most costly credit card balance. That was Discover Card, where my debt was $4,880. (The interest payments on this debt alone are about $130 per month.)

Last month we were still sweltering in the dog days of summer, not a good time to raise money, in fact the worst time, nevertheless I've gotten a running start at the Discover Card debt with four supporters contributing $250 each for the matching fund account. That takes the DC debt down to $3,880. There's still $1,000 open on the original matching-funds offer. You contribution of $250 or more can, literally, do double work here. Help with the working expenses of the Campus/Internet Project and get me out from under a serious debt overload that I found myself in about this time last year when my two primary funding sources dried up.

BUT THAT'S NOT ALL !

A NEW MATCHING-FUNDS OFFER !

A California supporter has offered an additional $1,000 in matching-funds. I had called him to ask for a contribution and he made me an offer I couldn't refuse. When I called he was a little short. He said he would send me $500 immediately if it were absolutely necessary, but that if I would wait 30 days he would put up $1,000 as a *second* matching funds offer. How could I refuse? His original offer of $500 would grow into $2,000 -- *if* I could get the matching funds. He suggested, with respect to his own matching funds, that I lower the minimum contribution from $250 to $150.

So -- there is still a total of $2,000 open in matching funds! $1,000 remains open from the Indiana offer with a contribution of $250 or more. And now there is the additional $1,000 offer open from the California supporter with a contribution of $150 or more. Your participation is needed, the funds will help support the Campus/Internet Project (it looks like that's what I'm beginning to call it) which is being positioned *now!*

I don't want to give the impression, with all this talk about the matching-funds offer, that other contributions are not important. It would be unfortunate indeed if those of you who have your own pattern of contributing were to think smaller contributions are not needed. If regular contributions fall of, then the funds received through the matching funds offer will have to take up that slack and won't go to get rid of the $14,000 total credit card debt (just reduced to $13,000) that I'm laboring under. Those who contribute only $5 a month are making a $60 yearly contribution to the work. That's considerably more than I would charge for *Smith's Report*, if I did charge for it. I'm very appreciative of each contribution I receive, and the assistance I receive in other ways.

Meanwhile, this Campus/Internet Project isn't something being envisioned for some time in the future. We already have name recognition with the campus press and national media, in half a dozen books published by the other side -- and we already have our space station out there in the cosmos (I like that image) on the Internet's World Wide Web. While the station is unarmed now, largely empty of content, we'll get significant weaponry up there in October, and then we'll begin looking around for windows of opportunity to transmit our message of Intellectual Freedom and the Good News about the gas chamber stories down to the waiting multitudes on earth.

Correspondence I read everything sent me but regretfully can not reply to that which is not of great immediate importance. All correspondence received is considered public domain unless specifically and plainly marked otherwise. If you do not want to be identified by name in SR, please say so in writing.

Because SR is a newsletter, not a magazine, there is not enough space to publish long letters in full. That should be obvious even to my friends. Letters of more than 800 words, which is about one page in SR, become *very* problematical.

Till next month . . . .

Bradley

Smith's Report is sent free to those who help with financial support, who monitor the press (including the college press) and send me relevant clippings, and who provide me with other kinds of information or help. If I hear from you, you'll hear from me. If you should hear from me but don't -- complain. Contributions, correspondence and information to

Bradley R. Smith,
PO Box 3267 Visalia CA 93278.
Tel: 209.627.8757 Fax: 209.733.2653